

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Pharmaceutical Science: New Insights and Developments</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4023
Title of the Manuscript:	Stability Indicating RP-HPLC Method For The Estimation Of Olutasidenib In Bulk Pharmaceutical Formulations
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses the development of a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method for Olutasidenib, which is a recently FDA-approved drug for IDH1-mutated Acute Myeloid Leukemia. The scientific community benefits from this robust analytical method as it fills a crucial gap in quantitative pharmaceutical analysis for novel anti-cancer agents. This work ensures compliance with ICH guidelines, which are pivotal for drug validation studies. It further provides foundational data to standardize Olutasidenib formulations, supporting both research and industry applications.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is appropriate as it clearly conveys the scope of the manuscript. No changes are required.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is well-drafted, but it could benefit from additional details on the method's sensitivity (mentioning the LOD and LOQ values) and the precision achieved in trials. This addition would enhance its informativeness for a broader audience.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. The method validation and forced degradation studies are in line with international standards, and the data are well-documented. However, minor clarifications in the description of chromatographic parameters would improve clarity for reproducibility.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are comprehensive and cover recent literature relevant to the study. No additional references are required at this stage.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally clear but requires grammatical corrections throughout the chapter for enhanced readability and scholarly presentation. Examples include sentence restructuring for better flow and correction of typographical errors.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Consider reducing the number of figures in the manuscript, particularly where multiple chromatograms (e.g., system precision and method precision) are shown for similar data points. Consolidation will improve the manuscript's conciseness.</li> <li>2) Include a summary table listing all stress conditions with corresponding degradation percentages for easy reference.</li> <li>3) Ensure consistent formatting of subheadings and tables for a professional appearance.</li> </ol>	

[Review Form3](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Sachin N. Kothawade</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>SCSSS's Sitabai Thite College of Pharmacy, India</b>